

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The issues in the instant application are as follows:

Claim 5 is objected to for informalities.

Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Applicant hereby traverses the outstanding objection and rejections, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal in light of the amendment and remarks contained herein. Claims 1 – 20 are pending in this application.

Applicant has amended the claims to correct informalities discovered during examination of the application by the Examiner. Specifically, claim 5 has been amended to correct the informality of the phrase “on said plurality” to read “on said plurality of community organizations.” No new matter has been added.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by *Lang*, U.S. Patent Application 20020046041 (hereinafter *Lang*).

It is the Examiner’s contention that all of the claims rejected are anticipated by *Lang*. However, to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a reference must teach every element of the claim, see M.P.E.P § 2131. Moreover, in order for a prior art reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to a claim, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim,” see M.P.E.P. § 2131, citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The Applicant respectfully submits that *Lang* does not teach every element of the rejected claims, nor does it teach the identical invention in as complete a detail as recited in those claims.

Lang teaches a service that “provide[s] reputation information to requesting clients,” Abstract. The *Lang* service “enables reputation information to be accessible on-line via a computer or telecommunications network,” *Lang*, para. [0005]. The reputation system may contain data for multiple parties, and for any given party, data may be stored for the party’s

reputation regarding multiple traits. *See Lang*, para. [0006]. The system also includes an automated reputation service for accessing the collection of reputation data on behalf of clients to provide the clients with data from that collection of reputation data. *See Lang*, para. [0009].

Claims 1 – 8

Claim 1 cites a reputation authority comprising, in pertinent part:

security measures for verifying identities of at least one of said user and plurality of community organizations; and

a communication system for receiving said reputation information and transmitting said reputation information to said plurality of community organizations responsive to an authorization received by said user. *Co19. 0042 - 0043*

In rejecting the “security measures for verifying the identities of at least one of said user and a plurality of community organizations” of claim 1, the Examiner cites *Lang*, paragraph 007, which states:

In accordance with one aspect of the present invention, an automated reputation service is provided for furnishing information regarding reputations and parties relative to multiple traits. The client is provided with access to the reputation service via a communications network to furnish the information regarding a reputation of the selected party relative to a given trait.

Although this citation speaks to the overall goal of the *Lang* invention, namely to provide an automated reputation service to furnish information regarding reputations, it does not teach or even suggest, let alone mention, a verification of the identities of at least one of said user and a plurality of community organizations.

Additionally, in rejecting the “communication system for receiving said reputation information and transmitting said information to said plurality of community organizations

responsive to an authorization received by said user," the Examiner cites paragraphs 0024 and 0028 of *Lang*. Paragraph 0024 states, in part:

The response may take many forms. For example, the response 20 may be an email containing the requested reputation information. Alternatively, a hard copy of the requested reputation information may be sent . . . Still further, the response 20 may take the form of an electronic communication other than an email message.

Paragraph 0028 states, in part:

The network 42 may be a computer network, such as a local area network (LAN) or a wide area network (WAN). The network 42 may be a computer network such as the Internet, an intranet, an extranet or another variety of computer network. . . . The network 42 may, in some instances, be a hybrid of both computer networks and telephone networks.

It would appear as though the Examiner reads *Lang* to describe a delivery method for delivering reputation information to the requesting client entities. However, nowhere in the referenced selections, or in the entirety of *Lang*, does *Lang* teach or even suggest the transmission of the reputation information responsive to an authorization received by the user (i.e. the party about which the reputation information is directed). Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the automated reputation service disclosed in *Lang* does not teach the invention described in claim 1.

Claims 2 – 8 depend directly from base claim 1, and thus inherit all of claim 1's limitations. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully asserts that, for the above reasons, claims 1 – 8 are patentable over the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of record.

Claims 9 – 14

Claim 9 provides, in pertinent part:

verifying an identity of one of an associated user and an accessing third party responsive to a request to access said centralized repository; . . . and

delivering at least one set of said identity attributes to said verified third party responsive to an authorization received from said verified associated user.

In rejecting claim 9, the Examiner cites *Lang*, paragraph 0032, which states:

The reputation information 50 may also include a party's reputation for accurately judging things. For example, the reputation information 50 of FIG. 3 includes information regarding the party's reputation for judging restaurants 76 and information regarding the party's reputation for judging music 78. Individuals with excellent reputations for judging restaurants may have the ability to financially exploit, such an ability via a computer network, by holding themselves out as on-line restaurant critics. Individuals with an excellent reputation for judging music may have opportunities to act as record critics or talent scouts. Along a similar vane, the reputation information 50 includes information regarding a reputation for judging wine 82. When a restaurant wishes to hire a sommelier, the restaurant may, for example, access the reputation service 10 to obtain the reputation for judging wine of applicants for the position.

As with the Examiner's cited support for the rejection of claim 1, nowhere in paragraph 0032 does *Lang* disclose a method for verifying the identity of the associated user and accessing third party attempting to get into the repository or requesting access to the repository. *Lang* merely states, in the selection cited by the Examiner, that the third party may access such a repository.

Furthermore, the Examiner cites *Lang* paragraphs 0043 through 0045 to support his rejection of "delivering at least one set of said identity attributes to said verified third party responsive to an authorization received from said verified associated user." However, as with the above cited selections, paragraphs 0043 through 0045 do not teach or suggest, let alone even mention, that *anything* is delivered to a verified third party in response to an authorization received from the verified associated user, about which the identity attributes are created. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the automated reputation service disclosed in *Lang* does not teach the invention described in claim 9.

Moreover, claims 10 – 14 depend directly from base claim 9, and thus inherit all of claim 9’s limitations. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully asserts that, for the above reasons, claims 9 – 14 are patentable over the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of record.

Claims 15 – 20

Claim 15 provides, in pertinent part:

means for verifying an identity of one of a plurality of users and a plurality of participating user communities responsive to a request to access said clearinghouse; ... and

means for releasing selected reliability data to one of said verified plurality of participating user communities responsive to consent given by said associated user.

In rejecting claim 15, the Examiner cites to *Lang* paragraphs 0029 – 0035 to support his rejection of the means for verifying an identity of one of a plurality of users and a plurality of participating user communities. However, paragraphs 0029 – 0035 do not teach or describe any means for so verifying. At the most, paragraphs 0029 and 0030 discuss a limited authorization process for participating user communities to handshake or use authorization protocols. *Lang* does not teach or suggest a similar authorization or verification procedure for a plurality of users as taught in claim 1.

Moreover, the Examiner cites to *Lang* paragraphs 0042 through 0046 to support his rejection of the “means for releasing selected reliability data ...responsive to consent given by said associated user.” However, as with each of the prior cited selections, *Lang* simply does **not** teach, suggest, or even mention that any type of reliability information is released in response to an associated user’s consent. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the automated reputation service disclosed in *Lang* does not teach the invention described in claim 15.

Claims 15 – 20 depend directly from base claim 14, and thus inherit all of claim 9’s limitations. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully asserts that, for the above reasons, claims 14 – 20 are patentable over the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of record.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "Version with markings to show changes made."

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 08-2025, under Order No. 10007376-1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail, Airbill No. EV256028447US, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.

Date of Deposit: May 30, 2003

Typed Name: John Pallivathukal

Signature: 

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Thomas J. Meaney
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No.: 41,990

Date: May 30, 2003

Telephone No. (214) 855-8230



Application No.: 09/774,727

Docket No.: 10007376-1

Version With Markings to Show Changes Made

5. (Amended) The reputation authority of claim 4 wherein said plurality of community organizations receives said reputation information in categories related to said activities conducted on said plurality of community organizations.

RECEIVED
JUN 04 2003
Technology Center 2100